

**REMARKS**

After entry of the foregoing claim amendments, claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-56, 58-72, and 74-88 will be pending. Claims 1, 19, 30, 41, 43, 58, 63, 74, 76, 80, 84 and 85 are independent claims.

Claims 3, 18, 57 and 73 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 13, 19, 24, 26, 27, 29-31, 33, 38, 40, 74, 75, 80, 84 and 85 have been amended. Support for the amendment may be found throughout Applicants' disclosure and, in particular, at least at ¶¶ [0015], [0086], [0090] and [0098].

Applicants have amended the specification to provide the application number of a copending application and to correct minor typographical errors. Applicants have also amended the Abstract to correct a minor typographical error. No new matter has been added.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Claims 19-29, 30-40 and 75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action suggests that the "at least one projection protocol" of claims 19 and 21, and the "at least one extension protocol" of claims 30 and 35 are not described in Applicants' specification. (Office Action, pages 3-4). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Support for the "at least one projection protocol" and the "at least one extension protocol" can be found throughout the specification, and at least in ¶¶ [0026], [0027], [0030], [0032], [0035], [0057], [0062], [0064] and [0143]. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the above rejections.

Claims 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38, 40 and 75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action suggests that the meaning of "an indication of said at least one indication" of claims 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38 and 40, and "blacking out the projection session" of claim 75 is unclear.

While Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, these claims have been amended without prejudice to further prosecution. Claims 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38 and 40, have been amended to recite "at least one indication of the at least one alternate display device" (*emphasis added*). Claim 75 has been amended to recite "~~blacking~~ blanking out the projection session on the alternate display device" (*emphasis added*). Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the section 112 rejections with respect to claims 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38, 40 and 75.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

Claims 76-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Chang (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200210059415 A1). In particular, the Office Action contends that the “user interface” in FIG. 8B of Chang discloses the “user interface mechanism of the computing device” of claim 76. (Office Action at Page 5). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of rejections because Chang does not teach or suggest specifying via *a user interface mechanism of a computing device* that the computing device is available to *receive* projected content.

Independent claim 76 recites a method for *receiving* projected content by a computing device from a content sending device. Specifically, the computing device specifies via *a user interface mechanism of the computing device* that it is available to *receive* projected content, and broadcasts its availability via a discovery protocol, so that a content sending device that is looking for available alternate display devices receives an indication that the machine is available. For example, a user may indicate via a user interface mechanism of his laptop whether he wants to “allow others to project” to his laptop. If the user selects “allow others to project”, his laptop may begin to broadcast its availability, so that a host that is looking for available alternate display devices may receive an indication that the laptop is available. (Specification, ¶[0102]). The user interface mechanism of claim 76 is located on the *content receiving device*.

In contrast, the “user interface” of Chang is located on a content *sending* device. (See Chang, FIG. 8B). Chang cannot properly be said to teach a user interface of the computing device that is available to *receive* projected content, as recited in Applicants’ claim 76. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that independent claim 76 patentably defines over the teachings of Chang. Applicants further respectfully submit that claims 77 and 78 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 76. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the section 102 rejections.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

Independent claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nurcahya (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200310225621 A1) in view of Chang. Claim 1 is directed to a method for projecting content from a computing device to alternate display device(s). Independent claim 85 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Olson (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 7140731 B2) in view of Reisman (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200310229900 A1).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, the step of “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the computing device and the selected at least one alternate ***display device***.” In addition, claim 1 has been further amended to emphasize that “the alternate display devices comprising at least one of a projector, a monitor, or a laptop.” Similarly, independent claim 85 also recites establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between a first computing device of the plurality of computing devices and the alternate ***display device***. In addition, claim 85 has been further amended to emphasize that “the alternate display device comprising at least one of a projector, a monitor, or a laptop.”

Neither Nurcahya, nor Chang, Reisman, or any other cited references teaches or suggests establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the computing device and the selected at least one alternate ***display device***, wherein the alternate display devices comprising at least one of a projector, a monitor, or a laptop as recited in claims 1 and 85.

The Office Action suggests that Reisman discloses establishing a remote session between a first computing device and an alternate display device. (Office Action, Pages 81-82). Reisman generally discloses methods for navigating hypermedia using multiple device sets. In Reisman, remote sessions are established between a client and “remote server or peer systems,” or between a client and a “peer or server.” (See Reisman , ¶¶[0051], [0105], [0479] and [0480]). In contrast, claims 1 and 85 recite a remote session “between the computing device and the selected at least one alternate ***display device***” (*emphasis added*). The remote sessions of Reisman are *not* between a computing device and an alternate ***display device***, but are between two *computing devices* at best. Reisman does not disclose any remote sessions between a computing device and a projector, nor does Reisman mention any remote sessions

between a computing device and a monitor. In fact, Reisman does not appear to be concerned with establishing a remote session for the purposes of displaying content on an alternate display device at all.

Therefore, Reisman does not disclose, teach, or suggest establishing a remote session between the computing device and the selected at least one alternate *display device*, wherein the alternate display devices comprising at least one of a projector, a monitor, or a laptop as recited in claims 1 and 85. Further, neither Nurcahya nor Chang, or any other cited references cures this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 85 are patentable over the cited references.

Independent claims 80 and 84 have similarly been amended, to recite establishing a remote computing session between the computing device and the alternate *display device*, wherein the alternate display devices comprising at least one of a projector, a monitor, or a laptop. Therefore, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 applies to claims 80 and 84. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 80 and 84 are patentably distinct over the cited references as applied.

Independent claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nurcahya in view of Chang. In particular, the Office Action cites Chang as allegedly teaching discovering whether at least one alternate display device is capable of receiving the content according to the at least one projection protocol. While Applicants respectfully disagree this is position, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 19 to emphasize that *whether the at least one alternate display is capable of receiving the content depends on at least one of a user configuration or whether the at least one alternate display is already in use*.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Nurcahya nor Chang, or any other cited references teaches *whether the at least one alternate display is capable of receiving the content depends on at least one of a user configuration or the at least one alternate display is already in use*. In Chang, output devices listen to service request signals broadcasted by an information apparatus, read the request, determine whether they can provide requested services, and respond whether they can provide the requested service. (See Chang, [0152]). However, Chang does not disclose the criteria for determining whether output devices can

provide requested services. Therefore, claim 19 is patentably distinct over Nurcahya in view of Chang.

Independent claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nurcahya in view of Chang. Claim 30 is directed to enabling a user to display *separate* content on a plurality of displays. As amended, claim 30 recites, *inter alia*, a computing device “comprising a plurality of portions of display content, having a plurality of displays capable of displaying *separate portions of the* content, effectively disaggregating the display of the computing device, the method comprising” (*emphasis added*). For example, a user may set his laptop in the meeting mode as he enters the client’s conference room. His laptop may discover a wireless projector in the room. The user’s laptop may have two or more portions of content to display, for example, a presentation and his notes. By enabling the projector to be used in an extended multi-monitor fashion, the projector may project the presentation, while the user’s laptop may show his notes. Effectively, the user’s display is disaggregated so it can be used as a second monitor. (Specification at ¶[0086]).

Neither Nurcahya nor Chang discloses interfacing with a user of a computing device that comprises a plurality of portions for display and a plurality of displays capable of displaying *separate portions of content, effectively disaggregating* the display of the computing device as recited in claim 30. While Nurcahya may disclose displaying the same content at multiple terminal displays, nowhere in Nurcahya discloses displaying separate content at different displays such that the display of the computing device is *effectively disaggregated*. Chang fails to cure this deficiency. Therefore, claim 30 is patentably distinct over Nurcahya in view of Chang.

Independent claims 41 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nurcahya in view of Chang and further in view of Reisman. In particular, the Office Action contends that it would have been obvious to establish a remote session between the computing device and the selected alternate display device, as allegedly taught by Reisman, in the computer readable medium or server computing device of Nurcahya, as modified by Chang, so that the advertising server can wirelessly project advertisements on the selected remote display terminals. (Office Action at Page 26). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection, because one skilled in the art at the time of the invention

was made would *not* have been motivated to combine the cited references to arrive at Applicants' invention.

The cited references do not suggest the desirability of the combination. (*See* MPEP § 2143.01). Claims 41 and 58 recite the limitation of establishing a remote computing session with a device. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Reisman with Nurcahya, as modified by Chang, so that the advertising server of Nurcahya can wirelessly project advertisements on the selected remote display terminals. (Office Action at Page 26). The conclusory statement in the Office Action is not evidence of a motivation to combine and modify, because Nurcahya has already disclosed a solution for wirelessly projecting advertisements on remote display terminals. For example, Nurcahya discloses "a wireless data communication interface positioned to provide wireless data communication to the global data communications network," and "a server wireless interface positioned in communication with the global data communications network to provide wireless data communications." (*See* Nurcahya, FIG. 5, ¶¶[0020], [0024], and [0027]).

Therefore, in view the wireless projection solution provided by Nurcahya, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would not select the same elements from the cited references for combination in the manner claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that it is improper to combine the Reisman teaching with the Nurcahya advertising system, as modified by Chang, due to the lack of motivation or suggestion to modify Nurcahya and Chang. Accordingly, claims 41 and 58 are patentable over Nurcahya in view of Reisman and Chang.

Independent claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Strunk (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200310078840 A1) in view of Chang. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection, because neither Strunk, nor Chang, or any other cited references teaches or suggests at least one other ***computing device*** that may be available to receive and display projected content.

While Strunk may disclose a Group Display Device for displaying advertisement, the Group Display Device of Strunk does not amount to a ***computing device*** as recited in claim 43. A computing device may be a laptop computer, a Tablet computer, a notebook computer, a sub-notebook computer and/or a handheld computing device, *etc.* (Specification at

¶[0004]). In contrast, there is no discussion in Strunk that indicates the Group Display Device is a computing device. Rather, Strunk defines the Group Display Device as “[a] device that is generally, but not necessarily, used for displaying visual information to two or more persons simultaneously.” (Strunk, ¶[0033]). In other words, the Group Display Devices of Strunk are large television screens, or large plasma display panels that are incapable of performing computations. (*Id.*).

Chang also fails to disclose at least one other *computing device* that may be available to receive and display projected content. Although Chang discloses an output device for outputting digital content, nowhere in Chang teaches that the output device is a computing device. Rather, Chang states that the output device disclosed therein is typically a printer, a display device such as televisions, monitors, and projectors. (Chang, ¶[0094]).

Neither Strunk nor Chang discloses, teaches, or suggests *at least one other computing device* that may be available to receive and display projected content as recited in claim 43, claim 43 is patentably distinct over Strunk and Chang.

Independent claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nurcahya in view of Chang and further in view of Microsoft in Education (Collaborating with others using NetMeeting, 1999 Microsoft Educator Tutorial Series). In particular, the Office Action cites Microsoft in Education as teaching establishing a connection between the computing device and the selected alternate display device. (Office Action at Page 38). The Office Action further suggests that it would have been obvious to establish a connection between the computing device and the selected alternate display device, as allegedly taught by Microsoft in Education, in the method of Nurcahya, as modified by Chang, so that the advertising server can wirelessly project advertisements on the selected remote display terminals. (*Id.*). Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection because it is improper to combine the Microsoft in Education teaching with the Nurcahya advertising system, as modified by Chang.

The cited references do not suggest the desirability of the combination. (*See* MPEP § 2143.01). Claim 63 is directed to a method for connecting a computing device to an alternate display device in order to project content from the computing device to the alternate display device. The recited method comprises *establishing a connection between the computing device and the selected alternate display device*. For the reasons stated above with respect to

claims 41 and 58, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Microsoft Educator with Nurcahya in order to wirelessly project advertisements. Accordingly, claim 63 is patentably distinct over Nurcahya in view of Chang and Microsoft Educator.

Independent claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Microsoft in Education in view of Chang. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection because neither Microsoft in Education nor Chang discloses receiving, *after establishing the connection*, from the alternate display device a session token that identifies a projection session between the alternate display device and the computing device.

Claim 74 is directed to a method for controlling an alternate display device. As amended, claim 74 recites, *inter alia*, “receiving, after establishing the connection, from the alternate display device a session token that identifies the projection session between the alternate display device” (*emphasis added*).

Neither Microsoft in Education nor Chang discloses receiving, *after establishing the connection*, from the alternate display device a session token that identifies a projection session between the alternate display device and the computing device. Microsoft in Education generally discloses how to use NetMeeting to conduct online training. While Microsoft in Education may disclose an “Accept/Reject” button that enables the call recipient to accept an invitation to join a NetMeeting call, the “Accept/Reject” button cannot be reasonably considered as a session token. Rather, the “Accept/Reject” button is merely a user interface control, which is devoid of any capability to identify a projection between the alternate display device and the computing device. Even assuming *arguendo*, that by clicking the “Accept” button, the system of Microsoft in Education sends a session token, the reference does not specifically disclose receiving a session token *after* the NetMeeting call has been established. Chang similarly fails to disclose receiving a session token *after* establishing the connection with the alternate display device. Therefore, claim 74 is patentable over Microsoft in Education in view of Chang.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 19, 30, 41, 43, 58, 63, 74, 76, 80, 84 and 85 patentably define over the teachings of Chang, Nurcahya, Reisman, Olson, Strunk and Microsoft in Education. As claims 2 and 4-



**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2899/300585.02  
**Application No.:** 10/786,833  
**Office Action Dated:** March 16, 2009

**PATENT**

17, depend from claim 1, claims 20-29 depend from claim 19, claims 31-40 depend from claim 30, and claim 42 depends from claim 41, claims 44-56 depend from claim 43, claims 59-62 depend from claim 58, and claims 64-72 depend from claim 63, claim 75 depends from claim 74, claims 77-79 depend from claim 76, and claims 81-83 depend from claim 80, Applicants further respectfully submit that claims 2, 4-17, 20-29, 31-40, 42, 44-56, 59-62, 64-72, 75, 77-79 and 81-83 patentably define over the teachings of Chiussi and Olarig. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the section 102 and 103 rejections.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application, including claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19-56, 58-72, and 74-88, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at this telephone number listed below.

Date: July 16, 2009

/Hilary A. Reinhardt/  
Hilary A. Reinhardt  
Registration No. 61,945

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439